

REMARKS

This is in response to the official action dated October 7, 2004. Reconsideration in view of the following is respectfully requested. Furthermore, it is requested that this response be entered and considered under final rejection: no new claims are added; the amendment to claim 12 is only to render the claim into independent and allowable form; all claims should be allowable, as the cited reference is clearly inapplicable.

Claim 12 was objected to in the previous action, but is not currently rejected. Accordingly, claim 12 is rendered in independent form by amendment incorporating the limitations of the intervening claims 9 and 10. Therefore, claim 12 is allowable.

Claims 9-11 and 13-14 are considered to be anticipated under 35 USC 102 in view of Boyle, US 5582385. Anticipation requires the presence of each and every element of the claims to be found in the prior art. Boyle clearly lacks several elements of the claimed invention, and therefore should be withdrawn as a basis of rejection. Likewise, as this reference is more remote than the previously cited references, the finality of the rejection is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

Boyle teaches a damping set-up between two bodies 18 and 16. There is a single spring 24 and a damper 26. The spring 24 and damper 26 are themselves arranged in parallel between the two bodies. Boyle is completely unrelated to the present invention, as it fails to disclose all of the following claimed elements:L

- *"second spring"* – Boyle teaches only one spring 24. The examiner includes elements 58, 56. However, a simple reading of the specification (col. 9, first full paragraph), as well as a review of Fig. 1, reveals that *these are not springs coupling the first and second mass*. Rather, they are merely stops or abutments for excess vertical motion. They do not couple the first and second mass in any way, and

therefore do not satisfy the limitation "a first mass coupled to a second mass via a first spring and a second spring", as Boyle teaches only the one coupling spring 24.

- *"damper arranged between the second spring and the first mass"* – the examiner does not specify how this particular key location of the damper is satisfied by Boyle; and in fact Boyle clearly does not teach such a limitation. Boyle shows the damper 26 linked directly between the first and second mass, while the spring 24 is also linked directly between the two masses.

Because of these clear failures of Boyle to teach all of the limitations of the claimed invention, there can be no anticipation, and the rejection must be withdrawn. Furthermore, because of this clear failure, it is not seen how Boyle could serve to support yet another final rejection, which once again places applicant in the position of having to file an RCE. The finality of the application must be withdrawn. The examiner is requested issue a Notice of Allowance on all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

  
NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

Bruce S. Londa (33,531)  
Attorney for Applicant  
Norris McLaughlin & Marcus P.A.  
220 East 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, N.Y. 10017  
Telephone: (212)808-0700  
Facsimile: (212)808-0844